

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. In response to the Office Action ("Action") mailed March 7, 2006, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 11, and 16. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

### **I. Claim Objections**

On page 2, the Action objects to claims 1-20 because of alleged informalities. The Action states that:

Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 recite limitations which may be performed. For example, the applicant claims that, "objects may be used more than once in a single report or may be used in more than one report and answers to the prompt object may be stored in association with the prompt object for later retrieval (claim 1, lines 10-12). These limitations are not positive limitations, in that the system is not required to perform such operations, merely that the system is capable of performing the limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 to overcome these objections and respectfully request that the objections to claims 1-20 be withdrawn.

### **II. Rejection of Claims 1-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Pages 3-8 of the Action reject claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,154,766 to Yost et al. ("Yost"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

#### **A. Response to the Rejection of Claim 1**

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A reporting system for creating a report, wherein the report may specify one or more prompt objects as properties of the report, comprising: an inner prompt object comprising a first question to be asked of a user and at least one validation property; an outer prompt

object comprising a second question to be asked of a user and at least one validation property; wherein the inner prompt object is nested within the outer prompt object, and wherein each of the inner and outer prompt objects is an object separate in object oriented programming terms from the report in which it is *contained* such that each of the inner and outer prompt objects is useable more than once in a single report or is useable in more than one report and answers to the prompt object are storable in association with the prompt object for later retrieval.  
(Emphasis added.)

Yost discloses:

A system for automatic generation of personalized output from an on-line analytical processing system. The system processes at least one scheduled service in an on-line analytical processing system and generates personalized output based on personalization information for subscribers of the service to one or more subscriber output devices. The system enables a user to specify global and service-specific personalization information including specification of multidimensional filters to be applied to services and the specification of trigger criteria to be satisfied before output is generated. Personalization information may also be set for each output device for a particular subscriber.  
(see Yost, Abstract.)

For at least the following reasons, Yost does not anticipate amended claim 1.

Yost does not disclose one or more prompt objects separate in object oriented programming terms from the report in which it is contained. Specifically, Yost does not disclose “each of the inner and outer prompt objects is an object separate in object oriented programming terms from the report in which it is *contained*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. The Action relies on Figure 3 and its description in column 11, line 1 to column 12, line 35 of Yost to anticipate these claim features. On page 3, the Action equates step 116 from Figures 3 of Yost with the claimed inner prompt object, and, on page 4, the Action equates step 118 from Figure 3 of Yost with the claimed outer prompt object. Thus, the Action appears to be arguing that each of step 116 and 118 of Yost is a prompt object and that each is separate in object oriented programming terms from a report in which it is contained. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Figure 3 of Yost describes a method 210 for performing step 100 in Figure 2. (See Yost, col. 10, ll. 59-62.)<sup>1</sup> In “step 100, one or more *services* are defined by users or system administrators for broadcast module 20 to monitor, as described in more detail below with respect to FIG. 4 [sic, FIG. 3], such as through service definition module 42.” (See Yost, col. 10, ll. 18-21; emphasis added.) In step 116 of FIG. 3, Yost discloses that “a user may name and provide a description of the *service* or *services* to be monitored. By providing a name and description, users may be able to uniquely identify the services from an object browser or in a service queue.” (See Yost, col. 10, ll. 62-67; emphasis added.) Yost provides a special definition for the term “service.” Yost discloses that:

A “*service*” as used herein should be understood to include one or more *reports* that are *scheduled to be run* against one or more data warehouses, relational databases, files in a directory, information from a web or file transfer protocol site, or information provided by a custom module, by a server system.  
(See Yost, col. 6, ll. 5-8; emphasis added.)

Next, in step 118, Yost discloses that “the user selects the type for the service.” (See Yost, col. 11, line 1.) Thus, in steps 116 and 118, Yost discloses a system where a user may name and provide a description of a service that includes one or more reports. The reports of Yost are “scheduled *to be* run,” which implies they have not yet run. (See Yost, col. 6, ll. 5-8; emphasis added.) In other words, steps 116 and 118 in Figure 3 of Yost allow a user to identify a service, which includes one or more reports, for monitoring.

Yost does not disclose, however, that steps 116 and 118 are contained within the service or within one or more of the reports. Rather, steps 116 and 118 of Yost prompt a user for information *before* a service is identified by the user, and hence *before* identifying the included one or more reports that are scheduled to be run. In other words, steps 116 and 118 of Yost

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants note that column 10 of Yost includes typographical errors with respect to the numbering of the figures. In line 1, Yost lists FIG. 3 instead of FIG. 2, and in lines 21 and 60, Yost lists FIG. 4 instead of FIG. 3. Applicants will refer to these figures by the correct numbering.

prompt a user to identify a service that includes one or more reports, and thus steps 116 and 118 of Yost are not prompts contained within the report. Hence, Yost does not disclose that each of steps 116 and 118 of Figure 3 is a prompt object and that each is an object separate in object oriented programming terms from the service (including the one or more reports) in which it is contained. Thus, the Action has not properly identified that Yost discloses “each of the inner and outer prompt objects is an object separate in object oriented programming terms from the report in which it is contained” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants believe that claim 1 is allowable over Yost and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, which depend from claim 1, also are in condition for allowance due to their dependence on an allowable claim.

B. Response to the Rejection of Claim 3

Claim 3 recites:

The system according to claim 2, wherein the first answer to the first question of the inner prompt object serves as a validation property to the second answer to the second question of the outer prompt object.

To reject this claim, the Action cites column 12, lines 6-14, which states:

After the user has named the service, selected the type, duration, and schedule for the service, the user may select the personalization type in step 124. For example, the user may select an option to either prevent personalization, require personalization, or allow personalize optionally. Upon completion of these steps, the service may be stored by service definition module 42 in a database structure to enable users to retrieve predefined services to subscribe to these services through subscription interface module 52.

On page 5, the Action further alleges:

Here, the user has the choice of having the personal settings stored in order to update preferences at a later time. These stored properties would then become the default validation properties when a user subscribed to or cancelled existing services.

Applicants respectfully disagree that Yost anticipates claim 3 for at least the following two reasons.

First, the Action is inconsistent when applying the disclosure of Yost to reject the claims. To reject claim 1, page 3 of the Action equates step 116 from Figures 3 of Yost with the claimed inner prompt object, and, page 4 of the Action equates step 118 from Figure 3 of Yost with the claimed outer prompt object. The response received from a user in step 116 of Yost is “to uniquely identify the services from an object browser or in a service queue.” (See Yost, col. 10, ll. 64-67). The response received from a user from step 118 of Yost is a selection of either a “scheduled service” or an “alert service.” (See Yost, col. 11, ll. 1-7.) Contrarily, when rejecting claim 3, the Action relies on “personal settings” and “validation properties” instead of the responses received to step 116 and 118 the Action previously associated with the claimed inner prompt object and the claimed outer prompt object, as discussed above. In this instance, the Action impermissibly selects from different sections of the disclosure of Yost without considering how the Action had already relied on Yost to reject the previous claims.

Second, Yost does not disclose that the response received to step 116 serves as a validation property to the response received to step 118. Yost discloses that the response received from a user in step 116 is “to uniquely identify the services from an object browser or in a service queue.” (See Yost, col. 10, ll. 64-67). Yost also discloses that the response received from a user from step 118 is either a selection of a “scheduled service” or an “alert service.” (See Yost, col. 11, ll. 1-7.) Yost does **not** disclose that the services identified in step 116 are a validation property for the “scheduled service” or the “alert service” selected in step 118. Rather, the “scheduled service” and the “alert service” describe a schedule of when services are to be run. (See Yost, col. 11, ll. 1-16.) Thus, the Action does not properly indicate that Yost discloses “wherein the **first answer** to the **first question** of the **inner prompt object** serves as a **validation property** to the **second answer** to the **second question** of the **outer prompt object**,”

as recited in claim 3. Therefore the Action has not properly shown that Yost anticipates claim 3, which is believed to be in condition for allowance.

C. Response to the Rejection of Claims 6-20

Independent claims 6, 11, and 16 are allowable for reasons analogous to those given in support of claim 1.

Claims 7-10, 12-15, and 17-20, which respectively depend from claims 6, 11, and 16, also are in condition for allowance due to their dependence on an allowable claim.

Claims 8, 13, and 18 also are in condition for allowance for reasons analogous to those given in support of claim 3.

**CONCLUSION**

For all the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. Any amendments are supported by the specification. Applicants accordingly submit that these claims are in a condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

This response is submitted within the three month shortened statutory period for reply.

Therefore, no extension of time fees are necessary. Authorization is hereby granted to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 50-0206 for any fees or credits, including any extra claims fee.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP



Date: June 7, 2006

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Brian Buroker  
Registration No. 39,125

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
Intellectual Property Department  
1900 K Street, NW, Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006-1109  
(202) 955-1500 (Telephone)  
(202) 778-2201 (Facsimile)